



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,219	11/12/2003	Yasuyuki Kitada	826.1902	4108

21171 7590 01/31/2007
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

DURNFORD GESZVAI, DILLON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/705,219	Applicant(s) KITADA, YASUYUKI	
	Examiner Dillon Durnford-Geszvain	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/12/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: ELECTRONIC APPLIANCE WITH MULTIPLE IMAGE CAPTURE UNITS ARRANGED ON DIFFERENT SIDES AND ITS SHOOTING METHOD.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims **1-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/31893 (Haermae, cited in IDS submitted 4/12/2004) in view of US 2002/0186315 (Yoshida et al.).

As to claim **1**, Haermae teaches an electronic appliance comprising: a first image capture unit 4 shooting an image; a second image capture unit 7, which is arranged on a side different from said first image capture unit, shooting an image (see Fig. 2); an

Art Unit: 2622

image capture selecting unit 20 selecting at least either of said first image capture unit and said second image capture unit (page 2 lines 1-5); and a shooting controlling unit 20 taking a shot by using at least either said first image capture unit and said second image capture unit, which is selected by said image capture selecting unit (page 2 lines 1-5). What Haermae does not teach is using illuminating devices for shooting targets in front of either camera.

However, Yoshida et al. teaches a camera with a movable photographing unit 2 where the flash 52 and lens 4 move together because it is disadvantageous to have a flash pointing in a direction that is not the same as the direction of the lens ([0011]). However, as one of the stated objectives of the invention of Haermae is to eliminate moving parts it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a light for illuminating a target for each of the image capture units as this would allow for images to be captured even when there is not enough ambient light to capture an image.

As to claim 2, see the rejection of claim 1 and note that the invention of Haermae in view of Yoshida et al. would teach lighting the illuminating device prior to image capture if a video and/or preview image is to be taken as a flash of light would be inappropriate for this purpose and the invention of Haermae is directed toward video conferencing so it would have been obvious to provide light during a video conference if there is not enough ambient light to make the user visible to a person with whom the user is having a video conference with.

As to claim 3, see the rejection of claim 1 and note that the invention of Haermae in view of Yoshida et al. would teach lighting the illuminating device in synchronization with shooting made with the image capture units as this would be ideal for still photography as is well known in the art.

As to claim 4, see the rejection of claim 1 and note that Haermae teaches capturing images simultaneously with both cameras (page 2 lines 12-16), however it is clear that Haermae does not intend to limit the invention to capturing only images simultaneously as it is intended to capture still images or video (page 3 lines 33-34) and it has a display 3 that can be used as a viewfinder for the cameras (page 2 lines 12-16).

As to claim 5, see the rejection of claim 1 and note that the invention of Haermae in view of Yoshida et al. would teach lighting the light that corresponds only to the camera(s) that is/are in use as it would waste power to light both lights if only one image capture unit is being used and similarly it would not make sense to light only one light if both of the image capture units were capturing images.

As to claim 6, see the rejection of claim 1 and note that as discussed in the rejections of claims 3 and 4 it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to turn on the light before image capture for a video capture mode and synchronously for a still capture mode.

As to claim 7, see the rejection of claim 1 and note that Haermae teaches a display unit 3 displaying an image from said first image capture unit 4 and/or said second image capture unit 7, which is selected by said image capture selecting unit 20 (page 2 lines 12-16).

As to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 7 and note that Haermae teaches that said first image capture unit 4 is provided on a same side as said display unit 3 (see Fig. 1a), and the invention of Haermae in view of Yoshida et al. would have taught that the light level of said first light is lower than a light level of a second light as the first imager with which the first light coincides with is adapted to taking pictures at a close distance (page 2 lines 31-35) and the second camera takes images at further distances (page 2 lines 31-35) and less light would be needed to see images at a close distance clearly.

As to claim 9, see the rejection of claim 1 and note that the electronic appliance is a cellular phone (see fig. 1a).

Claim 10 corresponds to claim 1 but uses means for language and therefore is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1 but using means for language.

Claim 11 is a method that corresponds to the apparatus of claim 1 and therefore

Art Unit: 2622

is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1 but drawn to a method.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dillon Durnford-Geszvain whose telephone number is (571) 272-2829. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ngoc-Yen Vu can be reached on (571) 272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dillon Durnford-Geszvain

1/22/2007



NGOC-YEN VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER